

Remarks

Claims 1, 5, 7, 9-15, 21, 23-26, 29-31, 35, 39, 41, 43, 49, and 51-54 are pending in the application. All claims stand rejected. By this paper, claims 1, 13-15, 29-31, 35, 41, and 43 have been amended. Reconsideration of all pending claims in view of the amendments and following remarks is respectfully requested.

All of the independent claims have been amended to variously recite:

associating sets of information with respective room identifiers corresponding to respective physical rooms in a home, the physical rooms being places where the sets of information are normally available or locations with which the sets of information are related, the information being unrelated to controlling devices within the respective physical rooms;

The limitation of associating information unrelated to controlling [computing] devices with a room identifier was introduced in Applicant's amendment of July 28, 2006.

Applicant pointed out that support for the amendment could be found, among other places, at page 7 of the specification. For example, one type of information could be a recipe, as illustrated in FIG. 7. A recipe is clearly "unrelated to controlling a device," much less a device in the "corresponding physical room," as claimed. Furthermore, a recipe is normally available a kitchen (*i.e.*, the corresponding physical room) , and is clearly related to the purpose of, and activities within, the physical room.

In the current Office Action, the Examiner argued that the aforementioned limitation did not satisfy the written description requirement. Specifically, the Office Action stated that:

Each independent claim calls for displaying information which is unrelated to **any** controlling computer device in the home in response to representation/information selection. Applicant asserts that support

is found for this limitation in the specification at page 7, lines 1+. Namely, the system displays information associated with “kitchen,” such as recipes, shopping lists, etc. However, However, it is important to note that this portion of the specification does not fully support the claimed limitation. In contrast, figures 5 and 6 show a menu displaying various features associated with living room and Bobby’s room such as Web, **TV**, and phone. Figures 10, 11, and 13 show a menu displaying various setting features associated with each room, e.g., setting active or inactive state for each service or device associated with each room. From this view, the various features or information presented in the menu(s) associated with living room and Bobby’s room must associate with at least a controlling computer device in home such as TV set.

Applicant respectfully submits that the Office Action is misconstruing the claim to require that all of the displayed information be unrelated to controlling a device. That is not what is being claimed. There is nothing in the claim that prevents the display of other information, functions, or settings for a computing device.

Applicant notes that the Examiner emphasized the word “any” in the above quotation from the Office Action. However, Applicant respectfully points out that “any” modifies “controlling computing devices.” This does not mean that the **only** information being displayed is information that does not relate to controlling a computing device. Rather, the claim language simply requires that there be sets of information “unrelated to controlling devices within the respective physical rooms.” To construe the claim otherwise would be to insert “consisting of” language into the claim rather than the “comprising” language, as written. In other words, if the specification discloses the display of a recipe, a shopping list, or the like, Applicant should be entitled to claim the display of information that is unrelated to controlling a device, notwithstanding the fact that some of Applicant’s figures additionally show functions, settings, etc., which do relate to controlling a device. None of the claims

exclude the possibility of such functions and settings also being associated with the recited room identifiers.

The claimed invention pertains to a method for organizing and categorizing information. Accordingly, information normally available in a garage, such as automobile maintenance information, may be categorized in a room identifier for the garage. Information relating to a family's budget may be categorized in a room identifier for the home office or study. Information relating to recipes may be categorized in a room identifier for the kitchen.

As previously argued. Ellis teaches an interactive program guide to control multiple devices within a household. Ellis, page 1, paragraphs [0011] and [0012], page 4, paragraph [0072], page 7, paragraph [0098], and page 9, paragraph [0116]. The control includes various media devices and options and settings associated with them. In Ellis, the program guide relates to the operation and control of devices in the different rooms. Thus, Ellis does not organize information into room categories which is unrelated to devices in those rooms. Indeed, Ellis is not concerned with information that does not operate and control computer devices. Furthermore, Ellis does not associate information with a room identifier corresponding to a physical rooms in the home “where the information is normally available or locations with which the sets of information are related.”

In discussing the 112 rejection, the Examiner goes on to state that “the information presented in each menu (as illustrated in figures 5-7, 10, 11, and 13) is directly provided by a set top box 120,” and thus “relate[s] to at least a controlling

computer device, *i.e.*, a set top box.” However, this argument is deficient in at least two respects.

First, Applicant respectfully submits that a person of ordinary skill in the art would not normally consider a recipe to be “information related to controlling a device,” as claimed. A set top box might be responsible for displaying a recipe, but the information, itself, is not “information related to controlling a device” in any reasonable interpretation of the phrase. For example, a recipe is not the same as the aforementioned functions and/or settings, which are also discussed in the present application.

Second, even if a recipe could be construed as information for controlling a device, it is not “information for controlling a device in the corresponding physical room,” as claimed. There is no suggestion that the set top box is located in the kitchen, such that the display of a recipe controls a set top box in the kitchen.

Based on the foregoing, the applicant respectfully submits the claims, as amended, satisfy the written description requirement of 35 U.S.C. 112, that all pending claims are in condition for allowance. Reconsideration and early allowance of all pending claims herein is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

Digeo, Inc.

By /Kory D. Christensen/
Kory D. Christensen
Registration No. 43,548

STOEL RIVES LLP
One Utah Center Suite 1100
201 S Main Street
Salt Lake City, UT 84111-4904
Telephone: (801) 328-3131
Facsimile: (801) 578-6999